


1998 King County Benchmark Report

TRACKING ACHIEVEMENT OF THE KING COUNTY COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES' TWENTY
YEAR GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR 37 CITIES AND UNINCORPORATED KING COUNTY

Algona Auburn Beaux Arts Bellevue Black Diamond Bothell Burien Carnation Covington Clyde Hill Des Moines Duvall
Enumclaw Federal Way Hunts Point Issaquah Kent Kirkland Lake Forest Park Maple Valley Medina Mercer Isnwand Milton
Newcastle Normandy Park North Bend Pacific Redmond Renton SeaTac Seattle Shoreline Skykomish Snoqualmie Tukwila
Unincorporated King County Woodinville Yarrow Point



King County, Washington



Metropolitan King County *Countywide Planning Policies* Benchmark Program
1998 King County Benchmark Report

Mission

The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall recommend to the Metropolitan King County Council a monitoring and benchmarks program to assess progress in meeting Countywide Planning Policies.

- a. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor shall establish a growth management monitoring advisory committee which shall recommend information to be reported annually to serve as indicators and benchmarks for growth management policies. The annual reporting shall incorporate the economic development policy indicators developed by the Fiscal Impact Analysis and Economic Development Task Force and other indicators as adopted by the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor, and shall consider housing indicators specified in policy AH-5. King County shall report the adopted growth management benchmarks annually.
- b. The Growth Management Planning Council or its successor should conduct a comprehensive evaluation to assess implementation of the Countywide Planning Policies. The evaluation should be initiated as indicated by results of the monitoring program, but no earlier than five years after adoption of the Phase II Amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies. The evaluation shall include opportunities for public involvement.
- c. If the purposes of these Planning Policies are not being achieved as evidenced by results of benchmarks and monitoring reports, the Growth Management Planning Council or its successor will reconvene at the request of a party to discuss, evaluate and recommend actions to achieve the purposes of the Policies.

Metropolitan King County Countywide Planning Policies: Framework Policy 1; Step 6.

For information about the **Benchmark Report** or the Benchmark Program, please contact Cynthia Moffitt, (206) 205-0709, FAX (206) 205-0719; e-mail: cynthia.moffitt@metrokc.gov. The Benchmark Program address is King County Office of Budget and Strategic Planning, Room 420, King County Courthouse, Seattle, WA 98104. 1998 Benchmark Report publication date: August 1998.

The **King County Countywide Planning Policies Benchmark Report** is a product of the Metropolitan King County Growth Management Planning Council. The **Report** is published annually by the King County Office of Budget and Strategic Planning. A companion to this **Report**, is the **King County Annual Growth Report** produced by King County Office of Budget and Strategic Planning. Both **Reports** are available on the Internet at <http://www.metrokc.gov>.

King County Growth Management Planning Council Members

Chair

Ron Sims, King County Executive

King County Council Caucus Representative

Cynthia Sullivan, King County Councilmember

Suburban Caucus Representative

Bob Edwards, City of Renton Councilmember

Seattle Caucus Representative

Sue Donaldson, City of Seattle Councilmember

GMPC Members

Howard Botts, Mayor, City of Black Diamond

Mike Creighton, Mayor, City of Bellevue

Richard Conlin, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Brian Derdowski, King County Councilmember

Sue Donaldson, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Jane Hague, King County Councilmember

Rosemarie Ives, Mayor, City of Redmond

Larry Phillips, King County Councilmember

Paul Schell, Mayor, City of Seattle

Shirley Thompson, Councilmember, City of SeaTac

Chris Vance, King County Councilmember

Alternate Members

Trish Borden, City of Auburn Councilmember

Martha Choe, City of Seattle Councilmember

Judy Clibborn, Councilmember, City of Mercer Island

Debbie Eddy, Councilmember, City of Kirkland

Larry Gossett, King County Councilmember

Scott Jepson, Councilmember, City of Shoreline

Nick Licata, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Margaret Pageler, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Tina Podlodowski, Councilmember, City of Seattle

George Rossman, Councilmember, City of Enumclaw

Peter Steinbrueck, Councilmember, City of Seattle

Pete von Reichbauer, King County Councilmember

Benchmark Committee

Co-Chairs

The Honorable Rosemarie Ives	Mayor, City of Redmond
The Honorable Richard Conlin	Councilmember, City of Seattle
The Honorable Cynthia Sullivan	King County Councilmember

Members

Rich Feldman Director, Worker Center King County Labor Council AFL-CIO
Fred Jarrett Manager, The Boeing Company
Marcia Hadley Executive Director, The Housing Partnership
Lee Hatcher Trustee, Sustainable Seattle
Larry Smith Attorney, Graham and Dunn
The Honorable Margaret Pageler City of Seattle, Councilmember
Kim Torp-Pedersen President/CEO, Torp-Pedersen Group

Staff

Cynthia Moffitt Project Manager
Rose Curran Lead Analyst and Editor
Tom Hauger City of Seattle Representative
Steven Cohn Suburban Cities Representative

Table of Contents

Mission	i
The Benchmark System	vi
Map: King County 20 Year Growth Plan	vii



Economic Development Summary	1
Indicators:	
#1 Real wages per worker.....	6
#2 Personal and median household income: King County compared to the United States	7
#3 Percentage of population below the poverty level	9
#4 New businesses created.....	11
#5 New jobs created by employment sector.....	12
#6 Employment in industries that export from the region.....	14
#7 Educational background of adult population	16
#8 High school graduation rate	18



Environment Summary	19
Indicators:	
#9 Land cover changes in urban and rural areas over time	25
#10 Air quality.....	27
#11 Energy consumption	29
#12 Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per year	31
#13 Surface water and groundwater quality.....	33
Map: Tri-County Watersheds and Major Streams	36
#14 Water consumption.....	39
#15 Change in groundwater levels.....	41
#16 Change in wetland acreage and functions	42
#17 Continuity of terrestrial and aquatic habitat networks	46
#18 Change in number of salmon	47
#19 Rate of increase in noise from vehicles, planes and yard equipment	52
#20 Pounds of waste disposed and recycled per capita.....	56



Affordable Housing Summary	57
Indicators:	
#21 Supply and demand for affordable housing	62
#22 Percent of income paid for housing	64
#23 Homelessness.....	67
#24 Home purchase affordability gap for buyers.....	68
#25 Home ownership rate	71



Affordable Housing, continued

Indicators:

#26 Apartment vacancy rate	73
<i>Map: Rural and Urban Subareas of King County</i>	74
#27 Trend of housing costs vs. income	75
#28 Public dollars spent for low income housing	77
#29 Housing affordable to low-income households	83



<i>Map: Parks, Rural and Resource Lands</i>	85
---	----

Land Use Summary	87
-------------------------------	----

Indicators:

#30 New housing units in Urban Areas and Rural/Resource Areas, and in Urban Centers	92
<i>Maps: Urban Centers</i>	95
#31 Employment in Urban and Rural/Resource Areas, Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers	100
#32 New housing units built through redevelopment	102
#33 Ratio of land consumption to population growth	104
#34 Ratio of achieved density to allowed density of residential development	105
#35 Ratio of land capacity to 20-year job and household targets	107
#36 Land with 6 years of infrastructure capacity	109
#37 Acres of urban parks and open space	110
#38 Ratio of jobs to housing in Central Puget Sound counties, and King County subregions	112
#39 Acres in forest land and farm land	114
#40 Number and average size of farms	116



Transportation Summary	117
-------------------------------------	-----

Indicators:

#41 Percent of residents who commute one way within 30 minutes	121
#42 Transit trips per person	122
#43 Percent of residents who use alternatives to the single occupant vehicle	124
#44 Ability of goods and services to move efficiently and cost effectively through the region	126
#45 Number of lane miles of city, county and state roads in need of repair and preservation	130

Appendix

Acknowledgments	135
List of Outcomes and Indicators	136

The Benchmark System for the *Countywide Planning Policies*

Background

In 1990 the Washington State Legislature passed the Growth Management Act (GMA). For the first time in the State's history, all urban counties and their cities were required to develop and adopt comprehensive plans and regulations to implement the plans. To achieve an interjurisdictional coordinated countywide plan, GMA further required that King County and its 35 cities first develop framework policies, the King County *Countywide Planning Policies*, to guide the development of the jurisdictions' plans.

The *Countywide Planning Policies* (CPPs) define the countywide vision for the county and cities' plans. The policies were developed by the Growth Management Planning Council, a group of 15 elected officials, representing all King County citizens, adopted by the Metropolitan King County Council and ratified by the cities in 1994.

Purpose

The *Countywide Planning Policies* are primarily goals that, if properly implemented, should improve the quality of life in King County during the next twenty years.

When the members of the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) approved the policies, they expressed an interest in creating a system that would tell future decision makers whether or not the policies are achieving their intended outcomes. The 1998 Benchmark Report is the third annual account to monitor the CPPs.

The purpose of creating a benchmark system is to provide the GMPC, other policy makers and the public with a method for evaluating jurisdictions' progress in implementing the *Countywide Planning Policies*. The system for the Benchmark Report was established by stating the outcomes of the CPPs; selecting relevant Indicators for each outcome, and then identifying quantifiable levels of achievement, or targets, for some of the Indicators.

Why a Benchmark Report for the Countywide Planning Policies?

Generally, the Indicators that the Benchmark Committee has produced should be used as the GMPC originally intended: to enable current and future decision makers to determine whether or not the *Countywide Planning Policies* are being implemented in a way which achieves their intended outcomes.

The Benchmark System, which includes these Indicators, should also provide early warning if the policies are not having their desired effects. In that case, the system should provide sufficient information to enable policy-makers to determine whether different actions to implement the policies are needed, or whether minor or major revisions to the policies are required.

More specifically, the Benchmark System should be used to help the jurisdictions of King County establish priorities, take joint actions, and direct resources to solve problems identified in the *Countywide Planning Policies*.

Data Sources in the Benchmark Report

The Benchmark Committee strives to provide the best data available for the Indicators to track the *Countywide Planning Policies* as adopted in 1994. In order to ensure data reliability, the Benchmark Committee will revise and, if necessary, correct data on an annual basis, when new and better sources become available.

20 year Growth Plan Map